



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

finding ever more articulate voices. Men are at last seeing that unity cannot be found in intellectual analyses of beliefs, however keen; nor can we ever again bow our heads, even nominally, to a central authority. Our unity must be in the divine organizing purpose of God, as that purpose is revealed in the historic Christ.

THOMAS C. HALL.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New York City.

A HARMONY OF THE HEXATEUCH

Professor Kent's *Beginnings of Hebrew History*¹ is not a history or a critical introduction, as its name would seem to indicate, but is a harmony of the Hexateuch and the book of Judges. A work of this sort has been needed so long that it is a pity that it is not given a title which at once indicates its scope. Ever since the days of the Jewish rabbis the fact has been recognized that there are duplicate narratives in the Pentateuch, and various attempts have been made to bring these into harmony with one another. In 1554 Calvin published a harmony of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, in which he perceived that the history and the legislation of Deuteronomy are largely parallel to the history and the legislation of Exodus-Numbers, and placed the similar sections in juxtaposition. Modern criticism of the last century has demonstrated that the duplication of material in the Pentateuch is far more extensive than the older commentators supposed. Not merely does Deuteronomy represent a tradition independent of the middle books, but Genesis-Numbers is found to consist of a compilation of three parallel narratives—the Jehovist, the Elohist, and the Priestly Code. As a result of this compilation nearly every episode of early Hebrew history is narrated in two variant forms, and many episodes are narrated in three or even four forms. The same sort of composition is found to be characteristic of the other historical books, so that most of the incidents of Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, are narrated in at least two different ways. Criticism has now advanced so far that it is able to recognize with reasonable certainty the limits of the several documents that enter into these historical books, and even where the sources cannot be named with certainty a duplication of material may frequently be detected. These facts make it desirable that we should have a book in which the parallel narratives of the Hexateuch and the other histories are

¹ *The Student's Old Testament: Vol. I, Narratives of the Beginnings of Hebrew History*, By Charles Foster Kent. New York: Scribner, 1904. xxxv+382 pages. \$2.75, net.

placed side by side after the familiar manner of a harmony of the gospels. A beginning in this direction was made by Carpenter and Harford-Battersby in the admirable table on pp. 272-79 of their *Hexateuch*, but Professor Kent is the first to carry out this idea to completion. For the successful execution of this task all students and all teachers of the Bible owe him a debt of gratitude.

The aims of the *Student's Old Testament* are thus formulated by the editor: (1) a logical classification of the material; (2) a comparative presentation of parallel narratives; (3) a clear modern translation; (4) a paragraphing that will bring out the literary form; and (5) a presentation of the reasons for the critical analysis in introductions and explanatory notes. The only one of these aims that is open to objection is the first. A logical classification of material means that all history must be put into one compartment, all poetry into another, and all law into a third. In the volume before us only narratives are given, while legislation and poetry are relegated to other volumes that are to appear later. The attempt to carry out this plan leads to many practical inconveniences. When, for instance, the Blessing of Jacob in Gen., chap. 49, is omitted, in order that it may be inserted later in the volume on poetry; or the Decalogue in Exod., chap. 20, in order that it may be given in the volume on legislation, this is as awkward as it would be to drop out the parables or the miracles from a harmony of the gospels, in order that they might be inserted in other volumes in which all the parables and all the miracles of the Bible were brought together. Again and again the author is compelled to break through a logical classification and to give poetical passages and laws without which the narrative would be unintelligible. Much of the Priestly document, such as the account of the circumcision of Isaac in Gen., chap. 17, is really legislation under the thin veil of historical narrative, and yet it is inserted in this volume. A careful study convinces me that the attempt to make a logical analysis alongside of a literary analysis is unwise. The two heterogeneous aims lead only to confusion. It would have been better to exhibit the Hexateuch harmonistically without regard to a logical distribution of its contents.

The critical analysis on which the assignment of passages to their respective sources rests is evidently the result of careful and independent study. The best recent authorities have been consulted, but no one has been followed slavishly. The author belongs to that advanced school which believes, not merely that it can discriminate between J, E, and P, but also that it can recognize two or three distinct layers in each of these documents, and can tell precisely which of the numerous redactors effected the patching

together of two extracts. There is a certainty in the assignment of many passages that does not correspond with the present state of critical knowledge and that is likely to create a false impression in the mind of the immature student. In such chapters as Gen., chaps. 15, 30, 31, 32, 34, and much of Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, one needs only to compare Kent with Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, or with any other critic, to see how far we are from a consensus of opinion. It would be wiser in all these doubtful passages to point out the fact that they bear evidence of being composite, but to refrain from attempting an analysis that represents merely the private opinion of the author. Such a frank admission of difficulties would serve only to emphasize more strongly the consensus of opinion in other cases.

Apart from the omissions due to an injudicious application of the principle of logical classification, this harmony is admirable. It is arranged in numbered sections in chronological order after the manner of a gospel harmony, and the parallel narratives are placed in columns alongside of one another. This is the best form, and it is hard to see why in a few cases the author has departed from it. Thus J's account of creation in Gen. 2:4b-24 should have been printed parallel to P's account in Gen., chap. 1, and not following it. The Early Judean narrative of the patriarch's deception in Gen., chap. 26, should have been placed alongside of the Later Judean and Early Ephraimite narratives, and not at the bottom of the page. Such departures from the regular practice serve only to confuse the reader. There are one hundred and fifty sections in all, and of these ninety-two contain double, triple, or quadruple accounts of the same events. Nothing could exhibit more strikingly the necessity for a critical analysis of the narrative portions of the Hexateuch and the book of Judges. When the volume on the laws is published, this will add several hundred to the list of doublets.

In no case has the author placed sections together that are not fairly regarded as parallels, but numerous parallels might have been given that are omitted from his comparison. Like many other persons, he seems not to see that contradictions are nothing but one form of parallelism. Two diametrically different versions of an incident should be placed side by side in a harmony quite as much as two slightly different versions. Failure to recognize this fact accounts apparently for the omission of notice of a large number of doublets. Thus in Gen. 4:26 we are told that Enoch was the first to call upon the name of Yahweh, while in Exod. 6:2 we are told that God was not known by this name to the patriarchs, but that he first revealed himself by this name to Moses. These independent conceptions of the origin of Yahweh-worship should be brought together in a harmony; but

this has not been done by Professor Kent. The Early Judean document in Gen. 9:25 f. gives the sons of Noah as Shem, Japhet, and Canaan; P gives them as Shem, Ham, and Japhet. These divergent traditions should be placed in comparison. In Gen. 10:7 Sheba and Havilah are given as sons of Ham. This should be placed parallel to Gen. 10:26-28, according to which Sheba and Havilah are sons of Shem. The two conceptions of the origin of the altar at Bethel in Gen. 12:8 and 35:7; the three conceptions of the meaning of the name Ishmael in Gen. 16:11, 17:20, and 21:17; the three interpretations of the origin of the name Isaac in Gen. 17:17, 18:12, and 21:6; the three explanations of the meaning of the name Beersheba in Gen. 21:31, 26:33, and 21:15-17; the two explanations of the name Jacob in Gen. 25:26 and 27:36; the three explanations of the origin of the name Bethel in Gen. 28:19, 28:22, and 35:15; the two explanations of the origin of the name Mahanaim in Gen. 32:2 and 32:7; the meeting with angels in Gen. 32:1 and 32:24; the two accounts of the origin of the name Israel in Gen. 32:28 and 35:10; the two conceptions of the name of Moses' father-in-law in Exod. 2:18 and 3:1; the two representations of what Moses did with his wife at the time of his return to Egypt in Exod. 4:20 and 18:2—are all cases of doublets, and should have been placed in parallel columns of the harmony. The value of a harmony consists in its giving a *complete* presentation of the duplicate or triplicate passages, and the omission of these and other doublets that might be mentioned is a serious defect in this work. It is to be hoped that in the volume on the laws all the parallels will be given down to the smallest details, even if this involves the insertion of a passage two or three times as it is looked at from one or another point of view.

The third aim of the author, to give a critical modern translation, is worthy of all praise. In these days when so many commentaries and introductions simply reprint the text of the Revised Version, or even of the King James Version, it is refreshing to find a work in which the text has as great exegetical value as the notes. Here we are spared the annoyance that so many authors inflict upon us of being compelled to read one translation at the top of the page and of being told in fine print at the bottom that the Hebrew means something entirely different. Professor Kent's translation is fresh and vigorous, and represents the best results of modern textual criticism and historico-philological exegesis. In every respect it is superior to the Revised Version, even in its slightly improved American form. Students of the Bible who do not understand, or do not believe in, the analysis of the Hexateuch will still derive much help from this lucid modern version. One wishes that the author would give it to us in a con-

secutive form with the sources indicated by letters in the margin, after the manner of Driver's *Genesis*. The harmonic form, while admirable for special students, is not adapted to the Sunday school or to the general reader.

The fourth aim, of exhibiting the literary form of the material, is praiseworthy and is well carried out. The division into short sections serves to emphasize the originally disconnected character of the stories that have been gathered into cycles, and the paragraphing corresponds with the logical divisions of the subject-matter. Poetic quotations are indicated by printing in poetic form with more consistency than is the case in the Revised Version.

The fifth aim, of providing critical notes necessary to explain and justify the analysis, is also good, and in the main is well executed. The notes at the bottom of the pages are admirable, and call attention to all the chief phenomena on which the partition of the sources rests. For the student who has the eyesight to read the microscopic print they will be instructive. The introductory chapters on pp. 1-48 seem to me less well adapted to their purpose. They discuss (1) "Israel's Heritage of Oral Traditions;" (2) "Their Transmission and Crystallization into Literature;" (3) "The Present Literary Form and Contents of Israel's Early Records;" (4) "Characteristics, Dates, and History of the Different Prophetic and Priestly Narratives." In this discussion the critical analysis is assumed, and a history of the beginnings of Hebrew literature is based upon it; but what the student who takes up such a book needs is a justification of the partition of the Hexateuch. The proper preface to a harmony of the Hexateuch and the Book of Judges would, I think, be a brief critical introduction to these works. Dr. Kent's discussion is good and interesting, but it does not prepare the student for what follows; in fact, he is not ready for this treatise until he has worked through the material in the body of the book. If it had been printed as an appendix rather than a preface, it would have been in a more logical position.

The typographical execution of this book must have been difficult, and in general a high degree of accuracy has been attained. The principal difficulty that I have noted is a lack of correspondence between the Table of Contents and Classification on pp. xiii-xxxiv and the body of the book. Thus Gen. 10:21 is omitted from the table on p. xiv, but on p. 70 is assigned to the Later Judean narrative. On p. xv a number of verses are assigned to J without the parenthesis that indicates a later stratum of the document, but on pp. 82, 83 these verses are given to the Later Judean source. On p. xvi Gen. 27:4-27 is a mistake for 27:24-27. Gen. 27:36b is a

mistake both in the table and in the body of the book, since the whole of vs. 36 is assigned to E. Gen. 29:24 is designated as secondary on p. 110, but not on p. xvi. On p. xvii Gen. 37:13 is given as a whole to J, but in the analysis on p. 127 vs. 13a is given to J and vs. 13b to E. The table gives Gen. 40:1-23 as all E¹, but pp. 130 and 131 give vss. 3b and 15b to E². In like manner 41:14b, 35b, and 42:28a are not designated as secondary in the table of contents. Gen. 41:46 is marked in the table as wholly secondary, but in the analysis vs. 46b is given to E¹. On p. xviii Gen. 48:8a should read 48:9a, and Exod. 1:7b-12 is inaccurate because in the parallel column vs. 7c is given to another source. Exod. 12:21 (p. xix) should be put into a parenthesis. Exod. 15:19-21 is assigned by the table to P, but in the analysis only 15:19 is given to P and vss. 20, 21 to E. Such discrepancies cause serious inconvenience to the person who wishes to use the harmony-table for ascertaining quickly the assignment of a particular verse to its source. The differences between the table and the body of the book are so numerous that one finds that he cannot trust the table, but must in every case hunt up the passage in the body of the book in order to be sure of the author's view. One is disposed, however, to excuse such minor inaccuracies in view of the enormous labor that Dr. Kent has evidently put upon this book, and the great service that it is sure to render in popularizing Old Testament criticism.

LEWIS BAYLES PATON.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

SOME NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS

Another attempt has been made, this time by Wrede,¹ to explain the fourth gospel as a theological polemic. If Baldensperger² could make a fairly reasonable argument for his unreasonable theory that the gospel was directed against the disciples of John the Baptist, we ought to expect Wrede to make out a much stronger case for his theory that the Jews were the enemies of the Christian church combated by the author. For if this book was written with a definite class of people in mind, whose claims the writer intended to discredit, then Wrede is right. If this book is a polemic, it is a polemic against the Jews. We are, however, convinced that the condition is contrary to fact. Wrede has read the gospel with much insight.

¹ *Charakter und Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums*. Von W. Wrede. Tübingen und Leipzig: Mohr, 1903. iv+71 pages. M. 1.25.

² *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums*, 1898. See *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, 1900, p. 522.